

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1914

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Ninety Branch Committees; 25,009* members in 391 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS MARY S. AMES.
MRS. JOHN BALCH.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS.
MISS AGNES IRWIN.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Vice-Presidents

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

TIME TO SHOW ONE'S COLORS

THE REMONSTRANCE appreciates the feeling of those conservative women who are so averse to political strife and to participation in public affairs that they have been reluctant even to take part in the anti-suffrage movement.

But the time has come when all such reluctance, however creditable in its motive, should be laid aside. For the sake of the very interests which these women hold most dear, they should now be ready to do violence, for the time, to their instincts and to aid actively in repelling the danger that threatens.

The more than 25,000 Massachusetts women who are enrolled in this Association, and who are busily en-

gaged in organizing the anti-suffrage sentiment in every town and city in the state are not in this work because they want to be in the limelight, or because they have any selfish ambitions to gratify. They have their own activities and interests,—domestic, social, charitable, religious,—to which they would fain devote their time and strength. They realize that whatever energy they expend upon anti-suffrage work is withdrawn from these activities. But they think it better to make this sacrifice for a time than to be compelled to make it permanently by having the responsibilities of the ballot thrust upon them. They do not accept the light view of the ballot taken by the suffragists who insist that it involves nothing more than dropping a piece of paper in a box on the way to market. They know that a right use of the ballot involves close study of public questions, close scrutiny of public men, attendance on and participation in primaries and conventions, and steadiness in voting at all elections; and all this at the heavy cost of the loss of the special influence which they are now able to exert—by reason of the very fact that they are non-partisan—and of the decline of chivalry among men. To avert such a disaster is worth some sacrifices.

The organized anti-suffragists have full confidence in the good sense, the magnanimity and the right intentions of the men of Massachusetts. But the men who may be called upon, in November, 1915, to decide this question *will want to do what they believe the majority of Massachusetts women wish them to do.* If it had not been for the bitter opposition of the suffragists, they would have had a chance to find out what Massachusetts women want, through a referendum.

Now, the only way in which they

can gain this knowledge is through the organized activity and open expression of the conservative women of the state. Such activity and expression become therefore a pressing duty.

Now is the time to show one's colors.

HOW ANTI-SUFFRAGE IS GROWING

CHEERING news comes from all the State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage. The Maine Association reports the formation of a large number of new branches; the membership of the New Jersey Association has grown from 413 to 8,000 within thirteen months; the membership of the Virginia Association has more than trebled within the past year; the anti-suffrage luncheon given by the New York Association at the Biltmore in April was the largest women's luncheon ever given in that city; the Connecticut Association has now more than 11,000 members; the Rhode Island Association added 1,600 to its membership list in ten days; and reports of rapidly increasing membership and activities come from Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Maryland and other states. New State Associations have been organized in Delaware, Georgia, Nevada, Nebraska, North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana and Wisconsin. As to Massachusetts, the number of branches has more than doubled during the year. At the annual meeting, Mrs. A. H. Parker, Chairman of the County Committee, reported new branches established in the following cities and towns during the year:

Acushnet; Ashland; Arlington; Brewster; Brighton; Canton; Everett; Fairhaven; Falmouth; Gloucester; Hamilton; Haverhill; Holliston; Hopedale and Milford; Hopkinton; Kingston; Lowell; Lawrence; Lin-

coln; Melrose; Manchester; Mattapoisett; Medford; Millis; Malden; Natick; Needham; Newton; Newton Centre; Newtonville; Norwood; North Andover; Pittsfield and Dalton; Princeton; Roslindale; Sharon; Swampscott; Waltham; Wareham; West Newton; Weston; West Roxbury; Westwood; Wilbraham; Wood's Hole.

AS TO COLORADO

TESTIFYING, May 28, before the Federal Commission on Industrial Relations, in session at New York, Judge Lindsey said:

"Colorado has perfected the science of corrupting men. Its judges, its supreme court judges, are owned like office boys. Its lawyers, its business men, all are owned. There are, of course, fearless men, but they have paid a heavy sacrifice for their fearlessness."

These words stand out as a strong indictment of a State where women have voted for more than twenty years, and to which suffragists have been in the habit of pointing with pride as a convincing demonstration of the uplifting influence of women. If they had been spoken by a prejudiced person or by an outsider, the suffragists would have dismissed them contemptuously. But it is Judge Lindsey, the suffragists' idol, who speaks.

It would be unfair to attribute the prevailing anarchy in Colorado to woman suffrage. If conditions prevail there which are a disgrace to civilization, if the Governor is weak, if the legislature is corrupt or incompetent, the men of the State are to blame. But the women must share the blame. They helped to nominate and to elect the Governor and the legislature. If they expect to claim all the credit when things go well, they must take their share of the responsibility when things go ill.

But it is to be noticed that Judge Lindsey's statement goes back of the present crisis and beyond it. He does not refer merely to the breakdown of civil government, and the demand made first upon the militia and then upon Federal troops to sup-

press violence. He says that "*Colorado has perfected the science of corrupting men.*" And it has done this, not only while women were voting on equal terms with men, but partly by the aid of their votes, as Judge Lindsey was at pains to show in his discussion of "the Beast and the System."

THE LEGISLATURE AND SUFFRAGE

THERE is a general concurrence of opinion among Massachusetts newspapers that the favorable action by the legislature this year upon the suffrage amendment does not point to any change of sentiment upon the question, either among the legislators or in the public at large, but that it was prompted only by a desire to throw the responsibility of settling the matter upon the electors.

Thus the Boston Evening Transcript of March 30 said: "Equal suffragists in and out of Massachusetts are mistaken in assuming, as some do, that the decisive vote by which the Legislature has this year voted to submit the suffrage amendment insures ultimate approval by the people of the proposal. Equal suffrage may come year after next in this Commonwealth, but a large number of legislators voted for submission this year in the belief that the people are only awaiting an opportunity to reject the proposal."

So, the Waltham News of March 27, under the heading "Let George Do It," said: "The cause of equal suffrage would not have had as easy sledding in the House and Senate if it were not generally believed that the people, when they come to pass upon the amendment, will effectually dispose of votes for women." And the Fall River Globe of March 12 remarked that the vote was "without special significance either in respect to the views of the members, or as a guide to public sentiment in Massachusetts," recalled the fact that, at the referendum in 1895 "the popular verdict, as indicated by the over-

whelming majority by which the proposition was defeated, was emphatically against such an unwise and undesirable departure from the established order of things in our political system" and predicted that "a similar adverse verdict will be returned" if the proposed amendment goes to the people. The Palmer Journal of April 2, in similar vein, said:

"The truth of this situation is that the Legislature and the politicians generally, feeling sure that the people will kill the amendment as soon as they get a chance at it, have taken this way of getting rid of the annual nuisance of hearing the suffragists and being bothered by their persistence in state politics. It was asserted and not denied that the majority of the House, so far as could be learned, was strongly against suffrage. Not a speaker claimed that there was a majority for it. One of the significant incidents of the voting was that the result was received in absolute absence of any demonstration. If it had been felt that the vote was a victory for suffrage, it would have been impossible to restrain the cheers. But not a cheer was given."

THE MILITANT'S SONG

Each morning, vigorous and bright,
I sing my little song:—
"If I don't do the thing that's right
I'll do the thing that's wrong."

And if I chance to miss my aim
By slight miscalculation,
I go on singing just the same
With equal exaltation.

So when I light my little sticks
To burn up "No. 8"
And find I've kindled "No. 6"
My joy is just as great.

And when my little stones I dash
At windows in a hurry
And hear the corner lamp-post smash
I see no cause to worry.

And when I take my little whip
To punish "Mr. A."
And find I've made another slip
I giggle out, "Hooray!"

And under lock and key I trill,
Although my cell's a strong one:—
"I didn't hit the right man, still
At least I hit the wrong one."
Punch.

A GREAT ANTI-SUFFRAGE MEETING**Faneuil Hall Packed to the Doors and Two Overflow Meetings Held****Crowds Turned Away, Unable to Find Room in Either Hall**

THE evening of April 28 witnessed the greatest anti-suffrage meeting ever held in Massachusetts. It was rather a group of meetings, for Faneuil Hall, in which the meeting had been called, was crowded to the doors long before the hour appointed; and it became necessary to hold two overflow meetings: one in the Ancients' armory, and the other in a smaller hall at the top of the building. Even then, crowds were turned away, unable to get into either of the halls. At all of the meetings, the audience was made up of men and women in about equal proportions. The utmost enthusiasm prevailed.

The speakers were ex-Governor Curtis Guild, who presided; Miss Marjorie Dorman, secretary of the Working Women's Anti-Suffrage League of New York; Mrs. A. J. George, field secretary of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women; and the Hon. John A. Matthews of the New Jersey legislature.

Besides the speakers, there were on the platform Mrs. James M. Codman, President of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women; Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Miss Mary S. Ames, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, Mrs. John Balch, Miss L. C. Post and Mrs. Henry Preston White, of the Executive Committee of the Association; J. M. Prendergast; D. L. Prendergast; Dr. Ernest Bernbaum of Harvard University; Professor F. Spencer Baldwin of Boston University; Hon. Charles L. Underhill; Truman R. Hawley; and Col. and Mrs. W. A. Gaston. Music was furnished by a band; and at the close of the meeting, the audience joined in singing "America."

The Burden of Proof on the Suffragists

Ex-Governor Guild, in calling the meeting to order, remarked that the sincerity and honesty of the suffragists are not to be questioned, but the burden of proof rests on them to show how woman suffrage would improve the world. They have as yet failed to show how the old-fashioned

family will be made happier by a defiance of nature's laws, or how government is improved by the assumption by the wife of the position of the husband. Underlying all the happiness of the people is the influence of a good home. The great mass of intelligent women do not want the ballot. The suffragists know this: otherwise why should they oppose submitting the question to the women of Massachusetts?

No Conspiracy of Men

Miss Marjorie Dorman denied that women had been kept from voting by a conspiracy of men. We are kept out, she said, by our own will and desire. What the suffragists are asking us to do is to double the expenditure of time, energy and money that is today required for carrying on our government, and the majority of sensible citizens, female as well as male, ask what return we should have. To get the answer, compare the results in the states where men alone vote, and those in states where men and women vote. The comparison shows that there is absolutely nothing which the citizens can obtain from the combined votes of men and women that we may not obtain at half price from the votes of men alone. Every prohibition state in the Union has been put on the map by the votes of men alone. The best child-labor laws are in states where only men vote, and women are as adequately protected in these states as in the suffrage states. Woman suffrage could only give the same thing at double the cost. In New York, it would cost millions of dollars to double the electorate.

Women Not a Class

Mrs. George said that the question which must be answered is: Shall woman contribute her offering to society in the identical way that man contributes his,—that is, through government? Women are not a class, they are a sex. Their interests are the same as those of men. To men hitherto have been entrusted the affairs of government. Women stand today for the duties of a moral and social life apart from the spectacular duty of exercising political power under stress of personal political ambition. After twenty years of woman suffrage, Colorado is today in a state of anarchy, her officials, elected by the votes of men and women, unable to maintain order within the state. Is it possible that the entrance of

women into politics has impaired the stability of the state? Every one believes in woman's right to make the most of herself, but it would be a brutal view of her "rights" to insist that the mother of her race shall forfeit her rights and exemptions before the law and in civil life and enter into competition with man.

Woman Not Inferior to Man

Mr. Matthews said that he did not believe that woman was inferior to man, but he claimed that the arguments of the suffragists were disproved not by sentiment but by facts. In the West, the uselessness of woman suffrage has been demonstrated. In the East, it is no longer only a question of votes for women,—it is a question of the economic, and with many of the suffragists, the sexual independence of women. Will you enfranchise women when the probable result will be the sacrifice of womanhood? If the suffrage movement means the destruction of the family every man and woman should oppose it. Many of the suffrage leaders believe in feminism. It leads them in the direction of what they call liberty, which really is license.

FORGERY FOR "THE CAUSE"

(From the San Francisco Argonaut, April 11, 1914.)

IF women are to be exempt from the legal consequences of murder—and there seems now to be no doubt about this—it would be the height of inconsistency to arraign them for the relatively venial offence of forgery. This, at least, appears to be the view of the authorities now engaged in the investigation of the fraudulent signatures to the recall and other petitions that have been plaguing the community. Nine women who were prominent in the Weller recall have confessed their forgeries—politely described as irregularities—to the grand jury. The hand writing expert finds that rows of names were written by the same person and that single members of households had signed for the whole family. But it need hardly be said that "there was no evidence of criminal intent" and that true bills are not to be returned. But a number of men who committed precisely the same offence are to be prosecuted, and for no better reason than the fact of their sex and the additional fact that their forgeries were not intended to sustain an "uplift" movement.

A SPECIMEN CALUMNY

UNDER the title "New Light Shed on Miss Bronson," The Woman's Journal of April 11 published the following:

An interesting incident in Miss Minnie Bronson's career has just come to light. New Jersey is a very wet State. Thus far all attempts even to secure a local-option law have failed. In the country at large, most of the people who do not favor State-wide prohibition believe that any locality has a right to vote out saloons if the majority of the men choose to do so; but it seems that Miss Bronson does not think so, as she spoke at a legislative hearing against the local option bill when it was pending in New Jersey several years ago.

Mrs. T. C. Bodine of Plainfield, N. J., head of the Evangelistic Department of the New Jersey W. C. T. U., writes to Mrs. W. H. Stokes of 9 Vought avenue, Freehold, N. J.:

"It was at Trenton in March, 1908, that I heard Miss Bronson speak before the committee on local option. She certainly spoke against the measure, and from her argument I presume that she was engaged by the Liquor Dealers' Association, since she seemed to represent them."

Comment would be superfluous.

Let us see whether comment on the foregoing accusation is "superfluous."

On the day of the legislative hearing referred to, March 2d, 1908, Miss Bronson was in Augusta, Georgia, on business for the United States Bureau of Labor, by which she was at that time employed. This fact is certified to by Ethelbert Stewart, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, under date April 22d, 1914. Obviously therefore, Mrs. Bodine did not hear her speak at the hearing against local option at Trenton, on that date, and her assumption that she was probably "engaged by the Liquor Dealers' Association" is groundless.

But, it will be asked, was not this merely a case of mistaken identity? Positive as is the form in which Mrs. Bodine framed the accusation which The Woman's Journal published so conspicuously, may she not have

heard some woman speak at that hearing whom she mistook for Miss Bronson?

That would have been bad enough. But Samuel Wilson, Assistant Superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of New Jersey, the organization which was pressing the local-option bill, writes under date April 22d, 1914: "No woman spoke against the bill and in fact, in all our experience, we have never known a woman to appear at a hearing against any temperance measure, or in favor of any liquor bill."

This statement proves that the libelous accusation which The Woman's Journal described as "shedding new light on Miss Bronson" was not based on a misapprehension but was a deliberate invention. What it actually "sheds new light on" is the unscrupulousness of suffrage leaders. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that Mrs. Bodine found it prudent to retract her statement in the following letter:

"April 25, 1914.

"MRS. A. M. DODGE.

"DEAR MADAM: Since convincing data has been brought to my attention that no woman spoke against the Crosby Local Option Bill at the hearing in Trenton, March 2, 1908, I hereby retract the statement quoted from me in the *Woman's Journal* of April 11, 1914. I was misinformed and greatly regret the injustice done Miss Bronson.

"Yours truly,

"(MRS. T. C.) S. W. BODINE."

The Woman's Journal also found it prudent to publish a retraction in its issue for May 9th. It will probably be a little less specific and a little more cautious the next time that it tries to prove that anti-suffragists are allies of the saloon interests.

SUFFRAGE AND INFANT MORTALITY

THE suffragists are in the habit of pointing to Finland to sustain their claim that a reduction in the rate of infant mortality will follow the concession of "votes for women." The argument runs thus: During the five

years preceding the grant of woman suffrage in Finland, the rate of infant mortality was 131 per 1,000. During the first five years succeeding the grant of the suffrage, the rate was only 117. Could anything be clearer?

But there are other comparisons to be drawn from the official statistics of Finland which the suffragists are not in the habit of emphasizing.

In 1905, just before woman suffrage was granted, the rate of suicides among Finnish women was 16.5 per million. In 1910, under woman suffrage, it was 40.4 per million. The male rate during the same period rose from 96.6 to 125 per million. Suppose that some one were to claim that political activity on the part of Finnish women had increased unhappiness among both men and women, leading to double the rate of suicide among women, and a large increase among men,—what would the suffragists reply?

Again, the percentage of living born children in Finland during the five years before women voted was 3.13 per cent of the average population. During the five years after they began to vote, it dropped to an average of 3.09 per cent. Was this due to woman suffrage?

Further, of 1,000 living born children during the five years 1901-1905, 65 were illegitimate; during the next five years, under woman suffrage, the number of illegitimate children per 1,000 was 70.3. This rate, by the way, was nearly double that in England and Wales during the same period. Had woman suffrage anything to do with it?

Once more, the yearly average of divorces for the years 1901-1905 was 124. During the next five years the yearly average was 165.6. Was this appalling increase the result of woman suffrage?

THE REMONSTRANCE does not venture to give an affirmative answer to these questions. But it would advise the suffragists, when in quest of evidence to show that woman suffrage promotes morality and the highest interests of the community to look somewhere else than to Finland to prove it.

CHICAGO'S "WOMAN BOSS"

THE Philadelphia Public Ledger of May 3 printed a letter by Emily B. Lynn, severely criticising a statement made by Miss Lucy Price of Cleveland at the recent state convention at Harrisburg of the Pennsylvania Anti-Suffrage Association. Miss Price was reported as saying that, at the Chicago election "the woman political boss" had delivered 500 votes to "Bathhouse John." Miss Lynn declared the statement "untrue in every particular" and went on to remark that "slander and falsehood are not the weapons of an honest adversary."

If suffragists would only take the trouble to investigate facts before resorting to vituperation, they would gain a good deal in the respect of the community. So widely-known and well-authenticated a suffrage organ as Harper's Weekly supplies full and picturesque details of the work of the "woman political boss" to whom Miss Price referred.

Harper's Weekly, in its issue for April 25, printed an article by Katharine Buell, whom it had especially commissioned as its representative to describe the Chicago election of April 7. The following is an extract from her report:

"Down in one of the poorest, dingiest streets in the city, on the fourth floor of a rickety tenement, lives Mrs. Blazi. Mrs. Blazi is a thing almost new in the world of politics,—a woman boss. Mrs. Blazi is a midwife, and she knows every Italian woman in that section of the city. She came to this country when she was young and poor and friendless, and she was taught her trade by Dr. Blodgett, a woman doctor of high-standing. She has brought two generations of Italian children into the world, and she is deeply beloved and entirely trusted by all the women of her race. They say she can deliver 500 votes in her ward. It is certain that she brought out 300 on registration day, and nearly as many to the election. Some one lends her an automobile, she stops in front of a tenement, she speaks to some one in the doorway, or in one of the windows, and in a few minutes one after

another of the Italian women with shawls over their heads and babies in their arms come down to follow Mrs. Blazi, and do anything she tells them to. Some of them do not speak any English. Many of them do not know what they are doing when they vote. They do what Mrs. Blazi tells them to. Mrs. Blazi is large and beautiful, her eyes are black, her cheeks are red, and though she sits with her little grandson in her arms, she does not look over thirty. She is strong and honest, and she loves the children, but she has a little, greasy, fat husband who is a low-down machine politician, and she is a good woman and lives up to her Italian principles. She takes the 500 women to the polls and votes them for Bathhouse John because her husband tells her to."

We have heard a good deal, since the Chicago election, of Miss Jane Addams, Miss Marion Drake, Mrs. McCormick, and the rest. But it was left to Katharine Buell and Harper's Weekly to give us this vivid picture of Mrs. Blazi, the woman boss who carries 500 women's votes in her hand, and, under the direction of her "greasy" "low-down" husband, turns them over obediently to Bathhouse John. It is a new and instructive glimpse of the possibilities of "woman in politics."

WOMEN WAGE-EARNERS

The figures of the English 1911 census show conclusively that in England and Wales the same conditions obtain as in the United States as regards the ages of women wage-earners.

Out of a total of 4,630,734 women employed in gainful occupations in 1911, 1,156,851 were from 15 to 19 years of age, and 1,037,321 were from 20 to 24. At the age 25-34, more than half of the women who had previously worked for their living had dropped out of industry.

The statistics refute the very common impression, which is diligently fostered by the suffragists, that an increasing number of women are being driven out into the labor market. There has been no increase during the decade in the number of women

at work relative to the total number of women; and, as the figures just cited show, before the age of 35, more than half of the women employed have quit work for marriage and the home.

On the other hand, the statistics show a remarkable steadiness in the percentage of men employed at various ages to the total number of males at the same period of life. The percentage at the years 15-19 is 91.7; at the years 20-24, 97.3; at the years 25-34, 98.6; at the years 35-44, 98.7; at the years 45-54, 96.7; at the years 55-64, 89.5.

It is clear from these figures that, in England as in this country, the factor which chiefly affects women's wages is the large proportion of women who go into industry with no intention of remaining in it. The average woman stops work at 30; the average man at 60. The percentage of men still at work at the age 55-64 is only 2.2 per cent less than at the age 15-19.

These are conditions which have nothing to do with the suffrage. They are natural conditions, which make the average man a wage-earner, and the average woman a wife and mother. They cannot be removed by any amount of suffrage agitation, nor is it well that they should be.

SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND

(William Crichton, of Wellington, New Zealand, in the New York Times, April 19, 1914.)

OUR experience is that the women of education and refinement, the women who think, do not seem to want to vote. The average married woman will vote as she thinks her husband is going to cast his ballot. If the married women of the laboring classes don't want to vote, the chances are that their husbands will beat them. What determines the vote of the rest it is difficult to imagine. Sometimes the results of our elections are enough to make the hair stand on end. A study of the working out of woman suffrage in New Zealand might be pursued with considerable profit by those of your people who are insisting upon giving women the ballot.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

THE annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women was held at the Copley-Plaza, Boston, April 22d, Mrs. James M. Codman presiding.

Mrs. Codman, in her address of welcome, remarked that the crowded hall bore witness to the interest in the cause. We must never admit, she said, that suffrage is coming; it will never come while we oppose it. She explained the legislative situation; and expressed confidence in the common sense of the men of the state, but urged the necessity of continued effort.

Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, chairman of the Education and Organization Committee, reported the present net membership of the Association as 23,312. The increase during the year was nearly 5,000, and more than half of the new members have joined since the first of January. More remarkable even than the growth in membership is the increase in the number of branch committees. Forty-five new committees have been added since the last annual meeting, making the total number 88. Some of these are in places of large importance, where there has long been need of active work. The number of meetings held during the year was nearly twice that of the preceding year. The teas at headquarters have been very successful; the annual luncheon at the Hotel Somerset not only filled the large ballroom but the smaller one as well; the pieces of literature distributed have exceeded 102,000; requests for our publications have come from all parts of the United States and from foreign countries; material has been furnished for over 200 debates; the new undertaking of the Anti-Suffrage Shop, first in Copley Square and later at No. 15 Milk street has been a great success, and large quantities of literature, buttons, seals, roses, etc., have been sold there; and educational work has been promoted by the Current Events classes and by the press work of the Publicity Committee. A new undertaking is the formation of a Public Interests Club, whose object is to branch out in new directions which it is felt could most appropriately be undertaken by a smaller body of women within the Association. Of the demands of the present situation Mrs. Putnam said: "The action of our legislature puts

us in a very different position from that we have hitherto occupied, though this vote, of course, means nothing more than that the legislators are heartily tired of suffragist hecklings, tired of being fought and sometimes defeated for voting according to their consciences, and so they are shirking further responsibility and thrusting back upon the people the duty of showing that Massachusetts is still sound of mind and heart, and, when the time comes, many of them intend to stump the State against the shoving of suffrage upon women. Although the suffragists know this perfectly well, this legislative action has heartened them to go about enlisting recruits with ardor unparalleled; and it therefore entails on us work which must be even harder and more unrelenting than theirs."

Mrs. A. H. Parker, chairman of the County Committee, described her encouraging experiences in organization work, and emphasized its importance; Mrs. Henry Preston White, chairman of the Publicity Committee, spoke of the rapidly widening scope of the press work carried on by that Committee; and Mrs. B. L. Robinson reported as an especially cheering feature of the winter's activity the establishment of Current Events classes and the enthusiasm with which their work was received.

Mrs. Codman read a resolution expressing the Association's sense of loss in the death of ex-Governor Draper, which was adopted, and copies ordered to be sent to the newspapers and to the family.

An especially gratifying feature of the meeting was the presence of the presidents of anti-suffrage Associations from three other New England States:—Mrs. Daniel A. Markham of Connecticut, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard of Rhode Island and Mrs. A. T. Dudley of New Hampshire. Mrs. Markham stated that her Association was able to report a membership of 10,000 at the Connecticut legislative hearing, and that it had gained 7,000 members in three months; but she recommended to all workers organized opposition as more effective with legislators than mere enrolment. Mrs. Hazard reported that Rhode Island anti-suffragists had especially emphasized the importance of their cause to the average woman occupied in domestic life, whose claims are often overlooked; and stated that at the Domestic Science Exhibit at

the State Food Fair 1,600 signatures were added to the Association's membership list in ten days, while many women declined to sign because of their utter hostility to the whole question. Mrs. Dudley reported the New Hampshire Association as two years old, and described the women of her state as slow in starting, but very good in holding on.

Miss Emily Bissell of Delaware, who was in the audience, was called upon and was enthusiastically received. She spoke briefly of the comparative suffrage apathy in her State, and mentioned the fact that the Delaware Federation of Woman's Clubs refused, by a large majority, to send a fraternal delegate to the recent state suffrage convention.

Mrs. John Balch referred to the approaching suffrage parade, and recommended that anti-suffragists make May 2d a "rose day," wearing their emblem in order that the city might not be given over to the yellow.

Officers were elected as follows: President, Mrs. James M. Codman; Vice-Presidents, Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. John Balch, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, pro tem., Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline; Recording Secretary, Miss E. C. Post; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong. Executive Committee, The Officers and Mrs. Robert S. Bradley, Mrs. Edward B. Cole, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, Mrs. Henry I. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Augustin H. Parker, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson, Mrs. Richard M. Saltonstall, Miss Evelyn Sears, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohler, Mrs. Barrett Wendell and Mrs. Henry Preston White.

ENGLISH TEACHERS OPPOSE SUFFRAGE

(From the Boston Herald, April 21, 1914.)

No fewer than 28,674 teachers of England have declared for woman suffrage, but the figures are less impressive when we read that 45,123 of the same profession have declared against it.

DR. SHAW AND "MEN WITH FOREIGN NAMES"

DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW's antipathy to "men with foreign names" in American politics seems to be inextinguishable. So long ago as May, 1911, as reported in the New York Mail-Express for May 25 of that year, Dr. Shaw declared that "Senator Grady and men like him, bearing foreign names, should not have the right to vote on a question of this sort" and she added: "The cause will not have the impetus which will bring success until men with American names are elected to the legislature and Congress."

Dr. Shaw at that time was especially irritated because Senator Grady had been active in shelving the suffrage bill. But press comments upon the narrowness of her views and her intimation that only men "with American names" should be elected to the legislature or to Congress were disturbing to the suffragists, and it was generally believed that Dr. Shaw would be more discreet in the future.

But Dr. Shaw seems to have learned nothing from the incident. April 1 of this year, addressing a crowded suffrage meeting in Tremont Temple, she said:

"There is not another country in the world that has submitted its women to the humiliation that American men have reduced their women to. German women are governed by German men. French women are governed by French men, but American women are governed by every kind of a man under the sun. There isn't a kind nor a color, black, red or yellow, that doesn't have part in governing American women."

Dr. Shaw's real grievance seems to be aimed at the principles which underlie all our institutions. Neither our constitutions nor our laws recognize the race distinctions upon which she places so much emphasis. The German-American citizen, the Franco-American citizen, the Irish-American citizen stand on the same footing with the American-born citizen. They have the same responsi-

bilities and privileges, they are imbued with the same patriotism, they render the same public service in peace and war. Until Dr. Shaw framed her protest, it had never occurred to any one to feel "humiliated" because they had a share in framing legislation.

To be consistent, Dr. Shaw should discriminate against foreign-born women as well as against foreign-born men. If the ground of discrimination is not ignorance, or bad character or unscrupulousness but merely foreign birth, it must apply to women as well as to men. If, as Dr. Shaw says, men "bearing foreign names, should not have the right to vote" upon questions of legislation, how can she favor giving that right to millions of foreign women?

SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION

CONFRONTED with the fact that, with the exception of Kansas, which adopted prohibition before it gave women the ballot, not one of the suffrage states has state-wide prohibition, the suffragists point to the extent of "dry" territory in suffrage states as evidence that the women's vote counts strongly on the side of temperance.

This argument overlooks two important facts.

The first is that the increase of "dry" territory is by no means limited to suffrage states. Neighboring male-suffrage states show similar and in some instances larger gains in this direction. Much has been made, naturally enough, of the number of saloons "voted out" through women's votes in certain Illinois towns and cities last April. But, in the same month, in the neighboring state of Minnesota, many saloons were "voted out" wholly by men's votes. It is to be remembered also that a "dry vote" by no means ends the matter. The more important question of its enforcement follows. Even under ordinary conditions, when a town or city becomes "dry" by men's votes, incessant activity and watchfulness

are necessary to prevent the vote from being made of no effect through lax enforcement. But, when the majority of the men in any community vote to license saloons and their votes are overridden by women's votes, the difficulty of enforcement must be greatly increased.

The second fact which the suffragist argument overlooks is that the true way to measure temperance results is not by the extent of "dry" area, but by the population living within it. Writing in the Rochester, N. Y., Post-Express of April 8, Mr. G. D. Blatchley directs attention to the fact that Wyoming has 98 per cent "dry" area, but only 34 per cent of its population are living in dry territory, and of these nearly one-fourth are Indians living on reservations which Federal law makes dry. So, Colorado has 92 per cent dry area and only 54 per cent of its inhabitants living in dry territory; Utah has 73 per cent dry territory and only 33 per cent of its inhabitants living therein; Washington has 87 per cent dry territory, dwelt in by only 42 per cent of its population; and California has 75 per cent dry area, but only 25 per cent of its population living in it. Idaho is the only exception in the group. There, the territory is 63 per cent dry, and 67 per cent of the population are in the dry area. As to California, to which the suffragists point buoyantly as having been practically redeemed by women's votes, Mr. Blatchley's figures show that not only are 75 per cent of its population living in "wet" territory, but that 15,768 persons hold Federal liquor license tax receipts within the state, while San Francisco, with a population of 417,000, has 2,103 saloons, or more per 1,000 of population than any city in the Union except Milwaukee.

Comparing these six suffrage states with the six nearest male-suffrage states with approximately the same area,—North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Montana and Nevada,—it appears that the six suffrage states have only 37 per cent of their population living in dry territory, while the six male-suffrage states have 70 per cent in dry territory.

This is a rather striking contrast.

WOMAN'S VOTE IN AUSTRALIA

MISS MARGARET HODGE, writing enthusiastically in the English suffrage organ, *Jus Suffragii*, upon the effect of the woman's vote in Australia, says:

"The conscientiousness of women is proverbial, and this quality has been shown in the very large number of women who have enrolled themselves as voters and have registered their votes. In some places the women voters who appeared at the polls showed a higher percentage than men."

Here are two statements,—first as to registration, second, as to voting. As Miss Hodge later explains that enrolment is compulsory, and failure to enrol incurs a penalty of two pounds, it is perhaps not strange that women register. But voting is a different thing. The Official Year-Book of the Commonwealth of Australia gives the statistics of the elections of 1903, 1906 and 1910, in not one of which did 57 per cent of the women registered record their votes, and adds this comment. "*In every instance the percentage of female voters is very far below that of the males,*

Again, Miss Hodge says:

"In these lands under the Southern Cross where women are enfranchised great progress has been made towards the securing of economic equality for men and women, and towards the destruction of a dual standard of morality."

Over against this vague and flowery statement may be set the following from Miss Jessie Ackerman's "Australia From a Woman's Point of View," Miss Ackerman herself being a suffragist, but concerned with facts rather than rhetoric:

"Although women in Australia enjoy partial equality with men in relation to citizenship, a sense of justice has never extended so far as to include the same standard for the sexes, either in pay for service or a similar code of laws for men and women. . . . I have before me the Federal and State reports concerning salaries and wages paid to Government employees. In no case since women have had the vote has there been an increase in their wages, bringing remuneration up to that of

men in any department where both sexes are employed."

THREE SUFFRAGE PROPOSALS

AMERICAN suffragists are scattering their forces in the support of three widely different suffrage proposals in Congress.

The Shafroth resolution, drawn and advocated by the Congressional Committee of the National Woman Suffrage Association, provides for an amendment to the Federal Constitution under which, when 8 per cent of the voters of any state sign an initiative petition asking for a referendum on woman suffrage, such a referendum must be held in the state, and if a majority of the legal voters voting on the question vote in favor of giving women equal political rights, the same shall thereupon be deemed established, anything in the constitution or laws of such state to the contrary, notwithstanding. The advantage of this proposal, from the point of view of those who advocate it, is that it avoids the race question, which makes against suffrage measures in the South, and that, if it were once ratified, it would make possible a succession of initiative-referendum campaigns in the several states without any action by the state legislatures.

The Bristow-Mondell resolution, which is ardently supported by the Congressional Union, proposes an amendment providing that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." It is identical with the resolution which was defeated in the Senate March 19, when 35 Senators voted for it and 34 against it,—a two-thirds affirmative vote being necessary for its passage. The Congressional Union strongly opposes the Shafroth resolution on the ground that, after its passage by Congress, and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, it will still be necessary to collect thirty-nine initiative petitions and to win thirty-nine referendum

campaigns; whereas the passage of the Bristow resolution by Congress and its ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States would at once give the ballot to the women of the whole country. The Congressional Union admonishes Congressmen that nothing short of the Bristow resolution will do, and that "by their record on this matter they will be judged as being for or against suffrage."

There is a third proposal, which has not attracted much attention, although the House Elections Committee gave a hearing on it, and it is strongly advocated by Mrs. Ida Husted Harper and others. This proposal is in the form of a bill which reads: "Women who are citizens of the United States and possess such qualifications . . . as may be required of men to make them legal voters in the several states shall be eligible to register and vote in all the states of the Union at all elections for senators of the United States and for members of the House of Representatives." This is not a new proposal. Rev. Olympia Brown was at the head of an association for pressing it nearly a quarter of a century ago. Mrs. Harper argues that the enactment of the bill would require only a majority vote in both houses of Congress, instead of a two-thirds vote and subsequent ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the states, as in the case of a constitutional amendment; and that, with women voting for senators and representatives in all of the states full suffrage would shortly follow. But as the first Article of the Federal Constitution expressly provides that the electors of members of the House of Representatives shall have in each state "the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature"; and as, with the exception of the nine suffrage states, it is required that such electors shall be "male" citizens, it is scarcely worth while to waste time discussing this proposal.

CHIVALRY OR JUSTICE

Writing in the Boston Herald of May 6, Mr. William H. Reed, Jr., said:

"In the suffrage parade there was one false note which probably alienated hundreds of people who were in general sympathetic to the cause. This was the float bearing the large red rose, with the inscription: 'The rose stands for chivalry. We want justice.'

"Now, any attempt to make it appear that chivalry and justice are contradictory terms seems to me very unfortunate. The man is chivalrous to womankind for the sake of the mother who bore him and reared him, for the sake of the wife who is the mother of his children, or the sister or daughter whom he would guard and protect. This feeling is rooted in the very depths of human nature, and no mere legislation or change in economic conditions can destroy it."

This is perfectly true and well-expressed. Anti-suffragists have no objection to the interpretation which the suffragist in the parade put upon their emblem. The red rose does stand for chivalry; but chivalry is justice, and a good deal more. It is unthinkable that a chivalrous man, or a chivalrous body of men, in public or private life, should treat women unjustly, should countenance unfair treatment of them, or should fail to protect them in every way possible. Respect, deference, courtesy, reverence,—all these are involved in chivalry, and they all make for justice.

But it is a pitiful and melancholy result of the sex-war which the suffragists are waging, and of the methods by which they are seeking to advance their cause that the sense of chivalry is declining. This is especially true in England, owing chiefly to the senseless outrages of the Pankhurst militants. Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun has recently said of it:

"Until a few years ago one could count upon a certain amount of collective respect among men for women. But something has happened to crowds and to audiences, as well as to the man in the street. It is notorious that public meetings of all kinds are more riotous. Every day, almost, one may read of some scene of vio-

lence in which women, as often as not, are involved. I do not for a moment attribute the whole of this development of mob rule to Suffragism, but I say that, so far as Suffragism has led women to open conflict with the law, to acts which, to the man in the street, are unwomanly, to acts provocative and to acts unruly, it has directly and powerfully stimulated the growth of the unruly, law-defying element in crowds, and has weakened, if not killed, that chivalrous element which formerly held the base one in check."

This change has not gone so far in this country as in England, because American suffragists have not made war upon society and defied all laws, after the fashion of the English suffragettes. But the tendency is in that direction. The average man would like to think the average woman to be better than himself,—more refined in her instincts, more pure in her motives, more unselfish in her conduct. But cross-country "hikes," shrill oratory at street corners, and suffrage parades with questionable features lessen his respect for women and make the old-fashioned chivalry seem out of date.

THE CHICAGO ELECTION

HERE are a few facts worth remembering in connection with the Chicago election on the 7th of April.

First: That, out of 516,292 women qualified to register, only 217,614 registered, and, of these, only 163,852 voted.

Second: That all of the women candidates for alderman were defeated.

Third: That there were only six wards out of thirty-five in which the women's vote affected the result. These were the 7th, 13th, 15th, 21st, 27th and 28th. In all of the other wards, the successful candidates would have been elected if no women had voted.

Fourth: The spectacular attempt to depose the notorious Bathhouse John in the First Ward was a gloomy failure. He was reelected by a plurality of more than 4,000.

Fifth: More women voted for Bathhouse John than against him.

He would have been reelected by women's votes if every man in the ward had stayed away from the polls.

The Woman's Journal of March 28 declared confidently: "Women voters will hold the balance of power in every ward in Chicago at the aldermanic elections of April 7, and the city is deeply impressed by the fact." Read in the light of the official returns, the statement is amusing.

SUFFRAGISTS are now complaining because the New York legislature refused to pass a bill providing that illegitimate children should inherit from parents or relatives of parents just as legitimate children do now. With "votes for women," they say, the result would have been different. But is it really for the interest of society or of womanhood that no discrimination should be made between legitimate and illegitimate children? Does the sanctity of marriage count for nothing?

THE ENGLISH "WILD WOMEN"

(From the Boston Transcript, June 10, 1914.)

THE "wild women" are growing wilder and while their offences from the beginning have taken a perfectly illogical form, they are increasing in violence and in volume. If the Government will not utilize the power it possesses to end this situation the people will. When clergymen of prominence favor giving the apparent efforts of these women to attain martyrdom a free course, it indicates with much significance what must be the sentiment of the great mass of the public who do not feel bound by those restraints that we look for in the profession.

Were Bill Sikes to set fire to an ancient estate or enter one of the British picture galleries and destroy an almost priceless work of art, British justice would very properly see to it that he would not have an opportunity to repeat his offence against society for many years, if ever. There is no "cat and mouse" law for him. If he would not eat he would have to take the consequences. Yet there should be fair play even for criminals, and Bill Sikes has a right to feel that he is ill-used when he sees a woman of gentle nurture doing things and released when the prison condition preys on her health.

SUFFRAGE STRATEGY IN DEBATES

It is a part of suffrage strategy, whenever there is a debate or any sort of a joint presentation of the suffrage question, to insist that the suffrage speaker should speak last. And when this claim is disputed, they taunt anti-suffragists with "wanting the last word."

But if anti-suffragists want the last word, in this instance, it is because all the rules of debate give it to them, and they see no reason why these rules should be violated in order to make things easier for the suffragists.

It is a fixed principle of discussion that the affirmative side of a question shall present its case first, and the negative last. It is not only fair, but necessary, that an audience shall first hear what a given proposition is and what can be said in favor of it; and then what are the arguments against it. Unless this order is followed, the negative side is put at the disadvantage of combatting a proposition which has not even been stated, and the audience is at the disadvantage of listening to denials and negations before it has had a chance to learn what the issue is.

Suppose that the question were that of the single tax. Would any sane person say that the negative side should marshal its arguments first, before the audience had any chance to find out what the single tax is?

The Henry George theorists propose to overturn the existing order of things in the matter of taxation.

The suffragists propose to overturn it in the matter of the ballot. In the one instance as in the other, the burden of proof rests with those who attack the established order. Theirs may be a good case or a bad one, but it is right that they should be required to state it. The reverse order is about as absurd as it would be to insist, in a trial at court, that the defence put in its case before the prosecution has made its charges and produced its witnesses.

Whenever this question comes up practically, anti-suffragists should be first in demanding the proper order of presentation.

AS TO "HI" GILL

THERE is something almost pathetic in the effort which The Woman's Journal has made to explain away the significance of the election of "Hi" Gill as Mayor of Seattle last March.

Mr. George Creel, writing enthusiastically in The Century for March on the question "What Have Women Done with the Vote?" cited as one of their chief achievements the recall of Gill in 1911, and described him thus:

"'Hi' Gill was the open and avowed champion of the saloon and disorderly house. He insisted that they were necessary to the prosperity of Seattle. The climax of this policy was reached when two huge municipal brothels were erected in a public street. It was then that the people recalled him, 22,000 women voting, each woman an anti-Gill committee of one."

That the Gill of 1914 is not essentially different from the Gill of 1911 and 1912 was made plain during the recent municipal campaign. Mrs. Silbaugh, one of the leaders in the anti-Gill movement in 1911, said March 1, 1914:

"If Gill has reformed, why is he trying to break down the red-light law? In the last two years he has repeatedly defended white slavers and people of the underworld."

And Mayor Cotterill, whose identification with good municipal government no one will dispute, said at a mass meeting:

"There is strength and power and influence in the statements of the women today, who said that if Gill wins there will go out from this city a message disastrous to those in other states seeking for suffrage and social advancement. I have received a letter asking me to prepare for a British member of Parliament the results of suffrage for women in this state. It would be a distasteful task to inform this Parliament member that Seattle had gone back into that from which she had arisen in righteous protest in years gone by, and

that the women had not done their part toward preventing that retrogression."

The disastrous message which Mayor Cotterill dreaded went out from Seattle on the 3d of March, when Gill was elected by a majority of 4,000. And, so far from its being due this time that each woman was "an anti-Gill committee of one," a majority of the women who voted were for Gill.

But The Woman's Journal made a determined effort to explain away the significance of the election. It appeared a little bedazed at first. In one editorial, in its issue for March 14, it explained the result on the ground that good citizens of Seattle were forced "to choose between two candidates both of whom were unacceptable to them"; while in the adjoining column, over the same editorial initials, it pronounced Gill's election "a victory for the right" and emphasized the improved platform on which he stood. Two years ago, when Gill ran on a reform platform, The Woman's Journal remarked that "people remembered Gill's previous administration too well." Apparently, it thinks that they have forgotten it by this time. The Woman's Journal, in the same article, charged that Gill's opponent, Mr. Trenholme, was backed by the corporations and by the liquor interests; but the citizens' committee of Seattle, which investigated campaign contributions, decided unanimously that Trenholme was not under the control of these influences, and that, while prior to the primary, the individual liquor dealers were divided between several candidates, "since the primary the larger portion of men in that business are for Mr. Gill."

It is quite likely that the Seattle liquor dealers who backed Mr. Gill knew what they were about and remembered what he did for them before. His selection of a good man for chief of police, upon which The Woman's Journal commented enthusiastically in a later article, will not probably shake their confidence.

THE PUBLIC INTERESTS LEAGUE.

A NEW branch of the Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Association has been formed, called the Public Interests League. For headquarters it has taken the entire ground floor of 685 Boylston street, in the Kensington Building, almost directly under the business offices of the Association at 687 Boylston street. The League has furnished the rooms comfortably and attractively, and kept open house on Saturday, June 13th, all day, to welcome its friends. The officers of the League are:—Mrs. James M. Codman, Honorary President; Mrs. John Balch, President; Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson, Vice-President; Mrs. C. B. Gulick, Secretary and Treasurer.

The motto of the League is: "Above liberty stands duty; above equality stands service." The purpose of the League is:

1. To provide a center for the rapidly increasing number of women who wish to ally themselves with the movement in opposition to woman suffrage and feminism.
2. To combat the demoralizing influences of the feminist movement which threaten not only social morality but civilization itself.
3. To educate public opinion to the true interests of women which cannot be separated from those of society in general.
4. To remind women as well as men that life is not saved by politics, but by principles.

The League has a membership fee of twenty-five cents, and invites everyone who sympathizes with its object to join. In the autumn it will announce a wide program of lectures, teas, musicals, etc. It is to have a reading room and rest room open all day, and Anti-Suffrage literature, buttons, stamps, etc., can be obtained there at any time. Its headquarters are to be also the headquarters of the new Wage Earners' League, which opened on June 13, with a membership of between six and seven hundred and which will hold regular

meetings in the autumn. The Anti-Suffrage Wage Earners' League in New York, although only a few months old, has a membership of over 4,000, and it is confidently expected that the Massachusetts League will soon be its rival in members.

NOT EXACTLY ARM IN ARM

AN article in the Christian Science Monitor for May 22, upon the growth of prohibition, opens with the statement that "Prohibition of the liquor traffic and equal suffrage for women throughout the United States are marching arm-in-arm down the corridors of history."

That sounds well, rhetorically; but it is not true.

Of the nine prohibition states, not one is a suffrage state except Kansas,—and Kansas adopted prohibition in 1880, thirty-two years before it gave women the vote.

The last vote upon prohibition in a suffrage state was in Colorado in 1912, when prohibition was defeated by a majority of 40,867.

Clearly, the two causes are not marching arm in arm.

MISDIRECTED ENERGY

(Molly Eliot Seawell in The North American Review.)

NEVER in the history of politics has there been a more vivid example of misdirected energy or greater unfamiliarity with the structure and history of the American government than in the efforts of the suffragists for a woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution. It requires only a rudimentary knowledge of the government and history of the United States to see the practical impossibility of three-fourths of the states adopting a suffrage amendment. The right of a state to create and control its own electorate is the cornerstone of its autonomy, and where there is a race problem involved, it is the rock upon which its civilization rests. The proposition made by the suffragists is that the states shall voluntarily give up to the federal government this fundamental right of creating and controlling their own electorates, a right upon which their liberties are based, and this for the sake of woman suffrage, which any state may acquire at any time without giving up any right of any sort.

MAYOR MITCHELL AND THE SUFFRAGISTS

(From The New York Times, May 6, 1914.)

It has long been apparent that the suffragists are never willing to admit that there are two sides to their case. All who refuse to swallow their doctrine without hesitation are numbered among the lost. Yet no great movement ever triumphed without opposition, and the only opposition Mr. Mitchell offered, in his expression of his ideas that comparatively few women want to vote and that the right to vote will not make women any happier, is surely worthy of polite and intelligent consideration. In our opinion, these are merely statements of incontrovertible facts. Comparatively few women want to vote. Suffrage would not lessen their burdens or make them happier.

Of course, they can find men who will flatter them and tell them they are better able to govern the world than its present governors, if men can be said to usurp the whole power of government in any civilized country nowadays. If men of that kind are the only ones they want at their meetings, why do they entreat public officers to attend them? If they want to be flattered and cajoled let them stick to the familiar type of male suffragist. Few intelligent men of large responsibilities can afford to go further in the encouragement of the suffrage movement than Mayor Mitchell did in Carnegie Hall, and he deserves gratitude, not abuse.

SOMETHING MORE THAN "HOUSEKEEPING"

(From the Brooklyn Life, April 18, 1914.)

THE paramount issues of today are basic issues, and if the hopes of the woman suffragists of this state are realized, the women of the state will become joint sharers with the men in a heavier burden of responsibility for the integrity of American institutions than has rested upon any electorate since the civil war; and if they wish to do their duty by the state they must dismiss from their minds the idea that government is merely housekeeping, and abandon the notion, which many suffragists seem to entertain, that such matters as the liquor traffic, child labor, the minimum wage and laws affecting women in particular are fundamental questions of government.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE four states in the Union in which Mormonism is strongest are all suffrage states. That is a fact about which suffrage writers and speakers preserve a discreet reticence.

THE Ontario Legislature last April defeated two woman suffrage bills: one a bill which proposed to give married women the municipal franchise, and the other a much wider measure which proposed to give every woman who had reached the age of 21 a vote in parliamentary elections.

THE adaptation of "America" which was sung at the suffrage demonstrations May 2d opened thus:

"My country, 'tis of thee
To make your women free,
This is our plea."

Apparently, among the different sorts of freedom which the suffragists seek is freedom from the ordinary rules of grammar.

EUGENE W. CHAPIN, former candidate on the Prohibition ticket for President, said regretfully at Long Beach, Cal., February 15, that the support expected by Prohibitionists in California from women had not yet developed. But why should Mr. Chapin have expected it, in view of the fact that Prohibition has not been helped by women's votes in any suffrage state?

MAY 2 will be remembered as "Rose Day." The anti-suffragists of Boston and vicinity utilized the day of the suffrage parade for a quiet demonstration of anti-suffrage sentiment. Accordingly, they wore the red rose,—the anti-suffrage emblem—and the newspapers recorded the fact that the anti-suffrage roses were seen quite as frequently on the streets as the suffrage yellow decoration of jonquils and daffodils.

THE real test of the interest of Chicago women in the April election is not the proportion of registered women who voted, but the proportion of women eligible to register

who registered and voted. There were 516,292 Chicago women qualified to register; of these, only 217,614 registered, and only 163,852 voted. In other words, only about 31 per cent of the women who might have voted did so.

THE abuse visited upon Mayor Mitchell of New York because, having yielded to urgent solicitation to preside at a suffrage demonstration, he did not speak with sufficient enthusiasm of the suffrage cause, is a characteristic episode. It recalls the hissing of President Taft when he addressed the national suffrage convention at Washington. It is not strange that, after this experience, Mayor Mitchell should say that "the progress of woman suffrage seems to be accompanied with a sacrifice of that which we have prized highly, the courtesy of women."

THE action of the Judiciary Committee of the national House of Representatives in reporting the suffrage amendment on the 5th of May has been unduly emphasized. It has been jubilantly stated that this is the first time that a suffrage amendment has been reported to the House. So far is this from being true that, so long ago as 1890, a suffrage amendment was reported both in the Senate and the House. The difference is that then both committees reported favorably, but this year the report was without recommendation. There does not seem to be much in that to justify suffragist rejoicing.

SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE, being interviewed, on his arrival in New York, May 27, upon the suffrage question, said that he thought that the patience of the English public had been tried to the straining point by the actions of the militant suffragettes, and that he would not be surprised at any time to hear that some of them had fallen victims to mob law. The prediction is likely to be fulfilled, if things continue as at present. The militants cannot go on indefinitely with their senseless war upon society without

some one striking back. More than once, the London police have had as hard a time protecting the suffragettes from violence as in restraining them from lawlessness.

NO HIGHER STANDARD

(From The New Bedford Standard, April 15, 1914.)

IT is unreasonable to expect of women, in the mass, any higher standard of judgment or moral perception or political wisdom than is expected of men: and not only unreasonable but useless, since they do not possess it.

NEW STATE ASSOCIATIONS OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. W. E. Godfrey, Mrs. N. K. Troutman, Mrs. J. E. Peacock.
Secretary, Mrs. B. L. Sutton.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Chairman of Press Committee, Miss Pendleton.

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. C. E. Conant, Wells; Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
Secretary, Mrs. Frank E. McGray, St. Paul.
Treasurer, Miss I. M. Schemmel, St. Paul.
Hon. Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Daniel R. Noyes, Mrs. H. S. Fairchild, St. Paul.
Board of Governors: Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Mrs. Alfred Pillsbury, Mrs. George H. Christian, Minn.; Mrs. D. F. DeWolf, Mrs. J. E. Ricketts, Mrs. Morton Barrows, Mrs. William Plant, St. Paul.

MONTANA

Temporary President, Mrs. Clinton H. Moore.
Secretary, Mrs. Theodore Simon.

NEBRASKA

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Chairman; Mrs. Henry W. Yates, Mrs. John C. Cowin, Mrs. J. W. Griffith, Mrs. W. H. Koenig, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Mrs. Gerrit Fort, Mrs. John L. Webster, Mrs. Helen Arion Lewis, Mrs. Arthur Crittenden Smith, Mrs. T. J. Mackay, Mrs. F. N. Conner, Miss Janet M. Wallace.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street, Omaha.
Treasurer, Mrs. Frank J. Hoel, 110 South 34th Street.

NEVADA

President, Mrs. Jewett Adams, Carson City.
First Vice-President, Mrs. R. G. Withers.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. D. Folsom, Mrs. J. E. Pickard, Mrs. C. L. Harwood, Mrs. Frank Bell, Mrs. F. J. Peck, Mrs. Frank Lee, Mrs. R. L. Fulton.
Secretary, Mrs. Fred Stadtmuller.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Katherin Collins.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. W. Hill.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. C. N. Frick, Lakota; Mrs. J. G. Gunderson, Aneta; Mrs. H. C. Chaffee, Amentia; Miss M. O. Movius, Lidgerwood; Mrs. T. L. Beiseker, Fessenden; Mrs. E. B. Goss, Bismarck; Mrs. C. W. Plain, Milton; Mrs. W. J. Reynolds, Westhope; Mrs. R. H. Bosard, Minot; Mrs. L. B. Dochterman, Williston; Mrs. C. S. Wolfe, Wahpeton.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.

WISCONSIN

President, Miss Mary L. Atwood.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Geo. H. Noyes.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. Frank L. Vance.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude S. Bean, 4 Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.